FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism: Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty; that in the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

VOL. VI. NO. 15. SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1900. WHOLE NO. 255.

DUTY.

Duty is but the power to do.
Who feels the need and conscious is of power
Must rise to act,
With not one thought but that occasion leads the way
And I am strong.

There is no skill that does not bind to use.
I must be all I am in all I do;
So flowers the plant,
So stars in heaven are bright,
So seasons circle on,
So life ascends.
The power within must full expression gain;
Such is the need supreme, the law of life.

Each must be free to live in truth unto himself;
No fear to check,
No gain to lure him on,
His mind unbought,
Each act his very own without reserve,—
And so, and to the end, will life advance.

Alcott P. O., Denver, Colo. VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

REALLY NICE PEOPLE ARE ALL ANARCHISTS.

It may not have occurred to you that all the really nice people you know—the people whose society truly refreshes you, whom you seek out with some eagerness, whose absence you sincerely miss, whose conversation delights you and goes to the right spot—the people who have initiative, who are original, whose praise praises, whose criticism illuminates, whose rebuke discredits—the people who possess vitality, spiritual if not also physical, who have a sense of humor, who do not get discouraged, who do not get scared—all the good and strong and juicy and hearty fellows, in short, and the women corresponding with them—it may not have occurred to you, I say, or you may not have happened to discover the fact that they are always Anarchists.

You may not have discovered the fact, and of course the persons in question themselves may not have discovered it—may not have formulated it to themselves in so many words. Persons of that genius are not accustomed to bother about accounting for or analyzing themselves; but they leave that to their biographers and enemies. But if you bring the conversation down to first principles, going back from one thing to another until you reach the early ideas, you will always find that your delightful, amiable, benevolent, easy-going friend is at heart anarchic; that he believes in obeying no laws; that he desires absolute freedom to do as he pleases, and that he is convinced that on no other terms can the human race be happy or realize its millennium. You will be able to draw from him the most appalling diatribes against all organized human authority; you will hear him explain all mortal troubles and disasters as the result of man attempting to rule man. He will play the bull to the red rags of law and order. He is not to be appeased with Democracy or Republicanism or State Socialism or centralization of any sort or degree; but there must be Anarchy pure and simple, and the eternal impossibility of any human being assuming control in the slightest degree the liberty of any other. One concession only may he be induced to make; you present to him the case of the solitary pioneer and radical sitting at night by his fire in the wilderness, and along comes another wanderer and solitary and sits down on the other side. "Get out of here," says the owner of the fire. "How's that?" returns the other. "Haven't I the right to sit by this fire if I want to?" "Yes," the other answers, "unless you interfere with my right to sit by it alone." You may get your Anarchist nod approval to that sentiment.

But let us not be misled by words. To be an Anarchist requires a well-balanced organization and a heart and brains. There are numerous creatures calling themselves Anarchists who have no more right to the august title than you have to enjoy civil rights in the planet Mars. These creatures are prone to assemble in beer saloons, to wear their hair and beards unkempt, and to plot and occasionally to do cowardly acts of violence and disorder. These are not genuine Anarchists, but bogus. True Anarchy begins at home; the man denounces the outward restraints of law, because the law is written in his own heart, and he obeys it unflinchingly. He does not want chaos, and will tolerate it far less than will many of the professing exponents of legality. This law in his heart is love, charity, disinterestenness, generosity, unselfishness. By appealing to his good nature or mercy you may get almost anything out of him; it is only when you assume to hector and domineer that you find yourself in trouble with him, and very serious trouble, too. It is also characteristic of him that he will fight for the rights of others more stubbornly than for his own; will fight for his own, indeed, only as he is the representative of others or of the oppressed in general. And he does not fight you personally or as in individual, but only in so far as you embody the abstract principle of oppression. For the Anarchist loves all men as ardently as he hates all evil; he distinguishes between the evil and its subject as does a doctor between the disease and the patient; and his effort is always to expel the evil, not to destroy the victim of it. Whether true Anarchists believe in God I cannot affirm; perhaps not, since the idea of God has been so much believed by commentators and the orthodox.....

◆ ◆ ◆

Prince Kropotkin, descendant of one of the oldest and most illiberal Russian noble families, is an Anarchist, and his book, "Memoirs of a Revolutionist," just published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., tells all about it. It is the best and most important book of the last twelve months at least; perhaps of many more months than that. We all of us should read it; not that doing so involves any hardship, for it is one of the most absorbing and fascinating books of the day; better than Richard Carvel or Janice Meredith in whatever respects those books are good, and better than other current biographies, because the subject of this book is so much more human and significant than all but one man out of ten thousand who get their lives written. But the best reason for reading it is that it will give you much to think about which will improve your intelligence and widen your knowledge; it will lead you to wonder whether after all things as they are, even in this devine republic of ours, might not be a little improved. Kropotkin is the most delightful companion imaginable; he is so good, so naive, so truthful, so amiable, so loving and gentile, and withal he has such prodigious erudition; not merely, or perhaps mostly, the erudition that is derived from books, but that which comes from experience of men and things, from the strange and moving advantures through which he has passed, from the persons of all degrees that he has known, from the czars of Russia down or up, from the unexplored lands which he has traversed; from the harrowing imprisonments which he has undergone and from which he has so amazingly escaped, and from the deep and earnest thought which he has bestowed upon all that came in his way, leading him to conclusions upon life and the theory of governments which are of vital interest to all who are capable of caring for anything beyond their own selfish circle. You will notice as you read that by changing a few names and external circumstances the abuses which he points out in the despotic government of Russia are flourishing quite actively here in the United States and appear in many cases far more unlikely to be removed because we have no single czar or acknowledged nobility upon him which to visit our displeasure. Moreover, there are no signs in this country of the existence of an immense body of people, born to wealth and endowed with intellect, who would abandon all that makes life agreeable for the sake of the people; who will go to the people, and live and work with and for them, spending their entire lives in so doing and committing to their children the heritage of the cause. There are as yet no symptoms among us of any such whole-hearted devotion to humanity. We give charity balls and go home afterwards in our carriages; but the Russion Nihilists worked early and late and slept hard and ate starvation fare, not because they had to, but because they would not live more luxuriously than the poor people whom they were instructing and helping; who would not believe in the sincerity of their self immolation unless it was guaranteed by such external, palpable proofs. There is no such thing in Russia as the worship of money and of money-makers that exists in free America; you may hope to get rid of despotism in a country where there is but one czar and his legitimate successors, but there is less hope in a country where everybody is a czar in his small or great way or is aiming to become one and wishes to destroy the other czars only in order to aggrandize himself. Kropotkin draws no such invidious distinctions, but after you studied him you may find yourself speculating on your own account.—Julian Hawthorne, in Denver Post.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

EFFORTS TO ENLARGE FREE SOCIETY.

Being anxious to see Free Society come out again as an eight page publication, the comrades here in Boston are making arrangements for a grand "FAIR" in order to raise a fund for the purpose of enlarging the paper.

Recently we made the fact known in the French Anarchist papers with the result that even our comrades in Paris, France, have promised to send us artistic articles as contributions for the projected affair to raise the necessary money. Some scattered comrades of the United States, with whom we happen to be acquainted, have also encouraged our efforts by offering their aid. But, to be successful, we need the co operation of all sympathizers of Free Society and therefore cordially request those that are interested in our undertaking to send us their addresses that we may communicate with them concerning the details of the fair. Write to D. Mikol, 16 Elm St., Chelsea, Mass., or K. A. Snellenberg, 9 Landsdowne St., Boston, Mass.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

For New York City.

The friend and agent of Free Socity, M. Maisel, 254 Madison St., has purchased a hundred dollars' worth of tickets for the performance of the tragedy "Der Juedische Koenig Lear," on March 6 at the Thalia Theatre, the proceeds of which he will contribute to the fund for enlarging Free Society, and therefore kindly asks the comrades to assist him in selling the tickets to the best advantage possible.

For Boston.

A Paris Commune commemoration will be held March 18, comrade Voltairine de Cleyre being the speaker. Hour and place will be given later.

FREE SOCIETY.

FORMERLY "THE FIREBRAND."

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Ass'n.

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 236 Clinton Park, San Francisco, Calif. For visitors off Market St. Castro car.

Anarchy.—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

A LETTER TO A PREACHER.

While visiting St. Louis on my present tour, I was made aware, through the press, of the presence in town of the "Reverend" Thomas Harrison, a revivalist who was having much success in inducing hysteria according to the regulation religious method. He was preaching in the Centenary Methodist Church, the pastor of which placed himself on record in the press in an extravagent eulogy of the "great evangelist." It is to this pastor that my letter is addressed, dealing with him from his own standpoint. Should he reply, the main question will be raised. The following extract from a published discourse of Harrison, together with a newspaper notice of an auction of pews in another Methodist Church, served as the basis of my letter. A more arrogant insult to the working classes was never uttered, than in these words of the clerical slanderer Harrison.

"How can I get the best things of life? God will not withhold any good thing from those who are clean of hand and pure of heart.

"Many of you have pains and aches, and you deserve them. You have not been living right. You have not been taking the right kind of exercise; you have not been eating the right kind of food. You have brought your own pains and aches upon yourselves. Many of you are ignorant, and it is your own fault, for you have not studied and observed. Many of you are poor, and with the most of those in that condition, the blame is all on them. They have not been frugal, industrious and temperate.

"At Trenton, N. J., recently, I was overwhelmed by observing the poverty that was prevalent among first class workmen. They had been working for years at good salaries, but when hard times came, they lost their jobs. None of them had anything for a rainy day. While they had been at work and making money, whenever a circus would come to town, each man would take his wife and six children. When he got out of work he blamed everybody, but himself, while he was to blame for it all. George W. Childs owed his success to the fact that he was frugal, industrious, and temperate."

Such a fellow as the author of the above tissue of falsehoods was of course unworthy of a direct reply; but to the preacher who endorsed him, I sent the following letter, which comrades to whom it was shown have requested me to copy for Free Society.

Rev. J. H. Young,

Dear Sir:—The three enclosed clippings from St. Louis daily newspapers lead me to write to you, although perhaps to no effect. While years ago compelled by conviction to sever my connection with the Christian Church, I do not feel toward it a spirit of virulent hatred, but would gladly welcome its cooperation whenever that can be secured in the work of establishing the principles of brotherhood and justice in social life. But such men as Mr. Harrison, and the attitude you take in endorsing him, tend to destroy all hopes of expecting to find the Church on the side of humanity. Does not Mr. Harrison know, do not you know, that the foundations of the great fortunes of today are laid by the monopolization of natural resources, and that frugality, industry, and temperance are wholly insufficient to save many an honest and able workingman from poverty? I never read a more cruel and heartless slander against the working classes than the enclosed utterances of Mr. Harrison. He has not a word to say against the idle rich, and the selfish lives they lead; but he imputes it as a crime to the workingman, if the latter seeks to relieve the dull routine of daily toil with the slighest recreation, and more so that he wishes his family to share the pleasure with him. He says that because a man takes his family to the circus once or twice a year, he lays nothing by for a rainy day. It must be "good salaries" that cannot stand so slight a drain! To crown his insult, he blames the workingman for getting out of work, and for hard times! A man so coarsely ignorant of economics should at least have the grace to veil his heartlessness and lack of sympathy for the masses under the cloak of silence. Yet some clergymen wonder why social reformers antagonize the Church, and why the Church has lost its hold on the workingman! It is because of just such men as Mr. Harrison, who fawn on the rich, and sneer at the poor, yet go without rebuke from their fellow preachers.

If you conceive of what you call conversion as an emotional process, due to a fear of being damned unless they experience it, beginning with a sense of self-humiliation, and culminating in the profession of belief in certain dogmas and in joining a certain organization, for the purpose of going through prescribed forms at certain intervals, then I grant that Mr. Harrison may be doing a great work. But if Christianity has any connection with social justice, he deserves less praise.

Mr. Harrison and the Apostle James would differ on many points, notably as to the "rich man" by whom the "wages of their labor is kept back by fraud," and would sympathize more with the Pharisees (the Rockefellers, Childs, and Carnegies of that day) who "devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers," than with the master who rebuked them, and who had only words of love and kindness for the poor, the toilers, and even the outcasts of his day. Have "the Churches killed their Christ?"

> "Have ye founded your thrones and altars then
> On the bodies and blood of living men?
> And think ye that dwelling can endure,
> Which shelters the noble, and crushes the poor?"

Ask yourself in the quiet of your own conscience, whether in the eagerness for many apparent "conversions," the Church is not in danger of forgetting her social gospel, the real work of the Lord, "to loosen them that are bound; to proclaim liberty through all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof; to let the oppressed go free; and that ye break every yoke." Read again this other enclosed clipping, the "sale of pews!" "The competition for seats!" In the name of him who drove the money changers from the temple! Read James ag in; and tell me what that apostle would say to the Churches of today, which "have regard [I quote from memory] to him that is clad in fine raimant," and has the longest purse. The best seats for the rich, of course, in the name of him who preached for the poor! "The common people heard him gladly;" the rulers and the wealthy respectable class hated and crucified him. Yet the Church of today is on its knees to the rulers, capitalists, and Pharisees, and preaches to the common people the duty of submitting to injustice and oppression, and cultivating all the slave virtues. A noble gospel that!

Pardon my frankness. I hardly know why I have written this, which you will doubtless ignore. But as I am traveling through the country in behalf of social freedom, and economic justice, I cannot keep silence when the powerful voice of the Church is raised in behalf of the classes, against the people. Should you feel that a brief correspondence might lead to a better conception of the truth by one or both of us, I shall be pleased to hear from you, and show entire courtesy in discussion. You may address me care of Carl Nold, 110 S. 16th St., St. Louis, Mo., and all letters will be promptly forwarded.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

"STIMULATING" A CRITIC.

Because I deprecated the indiscriminate abuse by Anarchists of all members of the legal profession, Comrade Streit finds his naturally "lethargic feelings" aroused, and proceeds to fire off his little gun at me, evidently in the hope that I will administer another "stimulant" by way of reply. I do not consider discussions of a personal nature of any value, but am always ready to oblige a friend by stimulating his naturally dull wits, and I will make no exception of Streit.

The comrade says my criticism of S. D. in defense of Henry Cohen is nothing but sophistry. I beg to remind him that there is a style of discussion, with which he seems very familiar, which does not even rise to the dignity of sophistical argument. Such animadversions as Streit indulges in generally arise from a narrow and prejudiced mind. The man swayed and warped by prejudice is totally unfit to pass upon the merits of any case. This is not only good logic but is recognized ethics the world over. My morals, whatever they may be, are my own, and provided they do not lead me into the offense of invading the liberty of my fellow beings they are not likely to prove very detrimental. Streit's criticism of my article in Free Society is remarkable for but one thing: it shows that even an Anarchist's prejudice may be stimulated to arouse him to say some very foolish things.

My critic says, "I have never yet heard of an Anarchist who desired Anarchist jury, judge or justice." This confession of ignorance of the teachings of a recognized school of Anarchists doubly unfits Streit from intelligently discussing the ethics of Anarchism. Perhaps it would be uncharitable to turn him over to the tender mercies of Tucker, Yarros, Cohen or any of the well informed Anarchists of the commercial school who have so often written on Anarchist jurisprudence. Comrade Streit says "Anarchist judges and justices are an impossibility." This is bare assertion, which is not supported by either proof or evidence. Until it is so supported it is not worth a moment's consideration.

Comrade Streit says he cannot conceive of a lawyer being an Anarchist when Anarchism repudiates all laws and government. Very well; Anarchism also repudiates all commercialism based on interest and profit; does my critic know of any Anarchist who is engaged in the business of commercialism? Anarchism also repudiates all wage slavery; can my critic conceive of a wage slave being an Anarchist? The fact of the matter is that there are Anarchists in every walk of life, and it is a mistake to set aside a particular profession or trade as too degrading for Anarchists to be engaged in. There are several good lawyers in the United States who are confessed Anarchists, and the chief justice of a State Supreme Court is strongly tinctured with Anarchistic sentiment. Why, I knew of an Anarchist in Illinois who afterward went to Wisconsin and became the keeper of a public house of prostitution, and I never heard that he was any the less an Anarchist for doing so.

Whatever may be said to the contrary, it is a fact that Anarchists often *do* appeal to the law to settle their differences, and many Anarchists (at least they call themselves Anarchists) sit on juries. When practicing law in Illinois a comrade engaged me to procure a divorce from his wife. Every Anarchist in Chicago knows that some of the most prominent Anarchists there have appealed to the courts, not once but many times. In this city I could name several Anarchists who have done the same, and others who haved served on juries. I am aware that a great deal of sentiment has been worked up over Anarchists refusing to perform jury service. This, in the very nature of the case is made a matter of publicity, and is no doubt a good method of propaganda. But is it not an open question whether more valuable results may be not obtained by an Anarchist serving on a jury and serving some poor fellow in trouble, perhaps a fellow radical, at the same time? Let me state a hypothetical case. Suppose a comrade, a conscientious believer in the propaganda by deed, gets into trouble and is arrested. Among the tailsman summoned to serve on the jury before whom he is to be tried are five good Anarchists. Would our Anarchist prisoner rather have these men refuse to sit the jury because they were Anarchists, or serve and attempt to clear him, or at least to cause a disagreement of the jury! To bring the case home let us suppose Comrade Streit to be the prisoner in question! I reiterate my former statement that it would be a very good thing for all Anarchists if there were many Anarchist judges and lawyers as well as Anarchists sitting on juries. The contention that no Anarchist could conscientiously serve on a jury or permit himself to be elected a judge or appointed a justice of the peace is a matter of opinion, and opens up the whole question of Anarchist ethics and tactics. Some maintain that Anarchists should always, under all circumstances, conform to the present prescribed rules of morality; that they should be always open in fighting the enemy; that they should never practice Jesuitical methods, not even when the best of results could be obtained. Others, among whom was the great Bakunin, hold that in the war against existing institutions all methods are justifiable; that open warfare against an enemy so powerful and full of resources as the capitalists is simply butting one's head against a stone wall; that in the end the secret, cautious, cunning work of the wily conspirator is far more effective than open warfare, and that the undermining process of propaganda is easier and will accomplish more against such fearful odds than the battering ram

method. Both theories have their advocates, and much c n be said in favor of both. The Anarchist who studies law and seeks to use the machinery of the law, whether as attorney, justice or judge, for the purpose of fighting invasive government simply a ms to fight the enemy with his own weapons. Surely he is better equipped for such a purpose than the man who is ignorant of the law and refuses to make use of the weapons within his reach.

Comrade Streit wants to know how often my "honest and sincere desire to obtain justice in the courts for the wage workers was crowned with success." Spare my blushes. Truth and candor compel me to say that I never really lost a case. Many a poor devil whom I knew to be "guilty" have I saved from a long term in the penitentiary, by processes known to most criminal lawyers; and I really took a diabolical delight in worsting the State in the game of craft and in saving poor unfortunates from its cruel grasp. And perhaps I ought to add that I never received a dollar for these services, although I have plenty of promisory notes still in my possession. After all, was I any the less an Anarchist, and a good Anarchist, because I did this?

I hope the above "stimulant" will serve to make Comrade Streit more thoughtful, broad-minded and generous, and less prone to air his prejudices in public. Intolerance is a relic of barbarism and the time when honest people were burned at the stake for expressing their opinions. Anarchists above all other people should be tolerant toward one another.

Denver, Colo. WILLIAM HOLMES.

A STRONG STIMULANT.

It seems that comrade R. Streit had a big dose of a strong stimulant, which waked his "lethargic feelings" so much that he makes a rather harsh criticism of comrade Wm. Holme's article of "Lawyers and Sich" in a previous number of Free Society. He considers it a "damaging admission on the part of Holmes not to see the inconsistency" of asking, "Why a person cannot be a good Anarchist because he practices law." For my part I cannot see the damaging part of the admission.

Comrade Holmes has been in the movement too long and suffered too much for the cause to be called in question, that is, to have his motive called in question simply because of his opinions, without calling forth a protest. Comrade Holmes has a right to his opinions, and, being one of the noblest workers in our ranks, it is not just to class him with Cohen, and speak of looking on him with suspicion simply because he may seem inconsistent to some one.

Then, too, if it is inconsistent to practice law, is it not equally so to work for wages, pay taxes, buy or sell? Anarchism repudiates all of these. Every time you buy a glass of beer, a drink of liquor, or of wine, a piece of tobacco, or a package of chewing gum, you pay a direct tax to the government. Is the comrade who criticizes the inconsistency in Comrade Holmes willing to let all these things—and a thousand others—alone in order to be consistent?

Oh, that horrible bogie of inconsistency! That, my dear comrade, is a question every one must determine for himself. We must all be inconsistent in order to exist in the present society, and it remains for each one to determine when, where and how he can come nearest living up to his ideal. That is the best he can do. It is not for any of us to say wherein another may or may not be inconsistent, for that is inconsistency, but to reduce or own inconsistency to the minimum. How best to do this, is again an individual question.

Voluntary co-operation may reduce the inconsistency of wage working. Frequent moves may lessen the inconsistency of rent paying, and so on, but circumstances and our immediate surroundings play a part in all these transactions.

"*True* Anarchiists will settle differences more justly amongst themselves," perhaps, but when one of the parties is not Anarchist and tries to beat an Anarchist out of a month's wages, what then? I went to law and got my wages, and will do it again if I have to. Nor do I consider myself any the less an Anarchist. Must I suffer, and cause those dependent upon me to suffer, rather than go to law, when some scoundrel tries to rob me of that portion of my earnings he promised as wages?

Oh that we could be broad-minded enough to see the folly of expecting consistency when it is an impossibility, and of contrasting acts and theories in the present society with what we expect in Anarchy!

It is not wise to sneer at others because they engage in occupations that will have no place in an Anarchist society, thus creating dis ensions where unity should prevail.

Let us be reasonable. When one amongst us can show how we can live absolutely consistent lives in the present society, I will be glad to hear from him or her. Until then let us be content to live as near our ideal as we can, not being too insistent on others toeing the mark we have drawn for ourselves. HENRY ADDIS.

ENGLISH SPEAKERS.

In No. 11 of Free Society Comrade Holmes, in his "Notes and Comments," makes a slight attack upon a plan of the Boston comrades to have an English comrade put in the field here as a propagandist. The suggestion was not exactly mine, but the outcome of a long-felt want among the comrades here generally. In a private letter to Free Society's editor I happened to speak about it, and so it occurred that that part of the letter was quoted and published.

I am glad to see that Comrade Holmes also feels the necessity of having a capable speaker in the field, and to keep him alive while agitating, we certainly ought to do something.

That all attempts to put a radical speaker in the field and keep him there by "*promise*" of liberal support will come to naught I also fear, and because of this very fear, we proposed a plan by which no promise was to be relied upon. We started a fund and anticipated that those comrades who favor this particular line of propaganda would do likewise, and not take any action in the matter until cash was on hand sufficient to guarantee such a propagandist a "living wage" for, let us say, one year.

It is true, we have women agitators, two in all. Their good and able qualities are unquestionable, but should we leave the agitation entirely to their efforts? Would they stand the strain? Besides, one of them has left us for an indefinite time, so there remains one for the present.

If it is a fact that in this great country we have sufficient material from which to choose, as Comrade Holmes says, I am sorry to say that it has never been disclosed to me. On the contrary, it has always appeared to me that the material from which to cut English speaking propagandists was so discouragingly limited, that, for at least two years, the work of agitation here in the east has almost exclusively been carried on by our two women propagandists.

Now, if there are so many able propagandists in our ranks, why do they not come to the front? Is it because of this living wage? I think they should show themselves first before they expect any moral and financial support from the comrades at large.

What pains me, however, in Comrade Holmes' comment, is to see him drawing a line between "England or any other country" and the United States. I always thought that Anarchists did not recognize artificial and political boundaries; that we divided the world between exploiters and exploited, but after reading this sentence I felt really as if some patriotic microbes had entered my lungs. If Comrade Holmes is justified in drawing the line across the ocean, others are equally justified in drawing it across the Mississippi river or any State boundary.

Preferable it would certainly be if every State, every city, every street, nay, every house had its own agitator and propagandist. In that case it would surely be unnecessary to send to England for one, but equally unnecessary to get one from Denver or any other out-of-the-way place, with this distinction: that if Boston was to send the invitation, the Englishman would likely come cheaper than the Denver man.

Boston. K. A. S.

MOST IN PORTLAND.

Comrade John Most spoke in this city Saturday eve, Feb. 3. Through the ene getic effort of a few interested comrades and the fairness of the local paper the meeting was the most successful ever held in this city. There were nearly 800 persons present who listened with earnest attention to the explanation of the aims and objects of Anarchy; the frequent applause showed how well the audience agreed with the most radical views advanced by the speaker.

The agitation carried on by the old Firebrand group in former years, has evidently borne its fruit, for all classes entertain at least a tolerance toward our ideas, entirely unknown in other quarters.

The speaker concluded the meeting with a short address in German in which his oratorical ability was shown in its best light, and the writer received a faint conception why this man was persecuted and imprisoned in all the German speaking countries of Europe. His impassioned, fiery denunciations of the present injustice and oppression were too dangerous for the continuance of the existing robber system.

A meeting had been arranged for Friday evening, but when we were notified that Comrade Most could not reach us in time, comrade Henry Addis delivered an address in order not to disappoint the audience entirely. To our surprise not a single person left the hall when informed that John Most could not be with us, but all seemed to be anxious to learn something of this new doctrine, whose advocates have disturbed the peace of mind of the rulers and legalized robbers all over the world. A debate which followed the lecture helped to clear away—to a considerable extent—many of the prejudices and erroneous ideas regarding our principles. A State Socialist and Single Taxer, whose wandering remarks consumed considerable time, received such a complete refutation of their unfounded assertions that they were completely squashed, to the evident enjoyment of the audience.

Of course since the meeting is over a person can hear any amount of criticism about our veteran comrade John Most. One complains about the severe attack on religion, others say the same about the State, and all of these carping critics say he is too blunt and outspoken. Evidently, in order not to hurt the sensitive souls of these pseudo-radicals, he should roll up his ideas in homeopathic pills and give them an allopathic coating of sugar and honey. These people have been petted and patted so much by scheming politicians that the naked truth forcibly expressed has become abhorrent to them. But happily such are in the minority, and the great majority is pleased to hear for once plain words and undisguised facts fearlessly expressed.

May our comrade, who has labored so long for the success of our cause, be with us for many years, is the earnest wish of all his admirers, including the writer.

CHAS. DOERING.

EMMA GOLDMAN IN DUNDEE, SCOTLAND.

The progress of our "indefatigable Emma," as reported in Free Society, during her tour through the States last summer, was followed with deep interest by all the comrades here; and when it was announced in the columns of Free Society that she intended to visit Britain, we made up our minds that, blow high, blow low, we should have her through to Dundee.

January 21 we saw our wish realized. She traveled from London to Glasgow on the 19th, delivered a lecture there and came on to Dundee next evening. Two meetings were advertized, and it was at one time feared that the first would have to be declared off, owing to a sudden disagreeable change in the weather—a common occurrence here—but a sufficient number turned up to allow of the business proceeding. The "powers that be" were represented by two detectives, who came in trying not to look ashamed of themselves. To mark our appreciation of this compliment, I presented each with a copy of Free Society.

Comrade Goldman prefaced her discourse on "Authority vs. Liberty" with a witty joke on "God," the church-goers and the weather, which at once put her on good terms with the audience. The lecture was very well received, the applause being frequent and hearty. But it was in the debate which followed that our coomrade showed to best advantage. No opponent, once answered, attempted a rejoinder.

After the meeting, three of the comrades, Fraser, Towns, and the writer, accompanied Emma to her hotel, and had tea with her, passing a very pleasant hour and a half. The weather cleared in the interval, and when we returned to the hall, the people were crowding in. It was packed by 6:30, and they kept coming in for some time after.

The subject chosen for the second meeting was, "The Aim of Humanity," and our comrade acquitted herself in the same splendid manner as before, both in the lecture and the dedate.

A quantity of literature was sold at each meeting. We look upon the affair as quite an event, and believe it will give the cause a "boost" in our locality.

We take this opportunity of sending our fraternal greetings to all the comrades on your side of the "pond." LOWDEN JOHN MCCARTNEY.

20, Wolsey St., Dundee, Scotland.

ERRATA: In the poem "From Life" in last week's issue read "blything cloud" instead of "blythed."

JOHN MOST IN DENVER.

The Labor Lyceum of this city was filled with a crowd numbering fully four hundred persons on Saturday evening, Jan. 10, attracted by the announcement that the famous Anarchist, John Most, would speak; but a telegram from Salt Lake had been received announcing his unavoidable delay, and instead of arriving Friday, as was expected, he did not reach the city until late Saturday night. Meanwhile our good comrade Victor E. Southworth had been requested to take the place of the advertised speaker, which he consented to do. Comrade Southworth took for his theme, "Anarchism," and spoke eloquently, forcibly, and logically for over an hour on the ethical phase of the subject, his large audience listening with the closest attention and frequently interrupting him with applause. Comrade Southworth planted himself fairly and squarely as an advocate of Anarchism, and expressed himself throughout with much feeling. Some of the brilliant lights of the S. L. P. were present and attempted to criticize the speaker, but he replied to them and easily answered their criticisms, turning their ridicule against themselves. The writer, being called upon, spoke briefly upon the economic aspect of Anarchism.

On Sunday afternoon, the hall was again filled to overflowing with an attentive audience. Comrade Southworth occupied the chair, and introduced the speaker of the day, our old comrade John Most. In his introductory remarks the chairman referred to the archaic condition of affairs in Kentucky, and branded as malicious and false the statements in the capitalistic press that Anarchy prevailed in that over-governed State. He showed conclusively that Anarchy was opposed to invasive force and violence of every kind. Anarchism is not to be found in the back alleys or slums. The greatest and best men have been and are Anarchists, and he referred to Emerson, Thoreau, Walt Whitman, Kropotkin, William Morris and others. He concluded by reading from a remarkable article which appeared that Morning in the Denver Post, written by Julian Hawthorne, the heading of which reads in part, "Really Nice People Are All Anarchists." (This article appears on page one of this issue.) Comrade Southworth also referred very feelingly to the late Myron W. Reed, the celebrated reform preacher of this city, quoting a number of his sayings bearing upon the liberty of the individual.

Comrade Most, who was evidently laboring under great physical disability, opened his address with an apology for his failure to appear on the evening before, and for any shortcomings which might be apparent in the talk he was about to give them. He declared himself an Anarchist and revolutionist, and said that although revolutionary Anarchists saw that a social revolution was inevitable, and that the issue must be met by the working people, yet on principle they were opposed to war and bloodshed. We Anarchists protest against the wholesale murders in the Philippine islands by the cheap hirelings of this government. We protest against the murders that are daily committed in the mines and workshops of this country. Neither are we thieves or robbers, but on the contrary we protest against the wholesale thievery of the capitalist class. Nor are we lunatics, for we protest against the lunatic asylums in which so many of the victims of capitalism are buried, and the lunatic methods of our commercial system which gives us warehouses piled high with shoes, clothing and wealth of every description, and hungry, ragged, barefooted people, who cannot obtain these goods because they have been robbed of their products. This is the lunatic asylum which we Anarchists propose to tear down. Speaking to the people of foreign birth in the audience more particularly, he reminded them that they came to this country rich in natural resources and found that capitalism had developed here in fifty years far more than in any other country in five hundred years. They found that the working people in this country were obliged to sell themselves just as they did in European countries. We have wiped chatel slavery out of existence in America, and now we are confronted with another kind of slavery which includes both white and black. This must also be abolished.

"We went from monarchical slavery to a republican form of government, then to democratic, and are no better off than before, only we don't know it. As soon as our oppressors saw that the people cared little for them they created a third power, called the power of God and the devil. They told the people that as long as they were tame they would go to heaven, but otherwise they would roast in hell. The Anarchists are fighting this power of private propertyship, State and Church. The Church was created only as a protectorate of private propertyism. Is there such a thing as a State for, by and of the people? The State is there to keep the people down, and the Church to keep them ignorant. Do you expect the Church or State to do anything for the poor as against the rich? That is absolute nonsense. You say take our grievances to the ballot. To get a majority is impossible. You all know that the machinery which creates sentiment is entirely in the hands of the capitalistic element and that they control the press, pulpit and State. The majority, according to capital, is not entitled to rule, and all the intelligence is in the minority. We are oppressed and down-trodden. Because five men undertook to exercise the right of free speech in 1887 they were murdered. If we kick, the capitalists say, 'We'll shoot you down.' Where are we now? The rich are getting richer and the poor, poorer. The capitalists have within the last ten years secured control of your government. Where will you be in the next ten years? You will be just at the point of a revolution. The people cannot stand the present society any longer, and the conclusion is that such society must be got rid of altogether. We must abolish the State, Church and capitalism and be one for one, all for all, or we will never have peace and harmony."

At the conclusion of Comrade Most's address, chairman Soutworth said: "Tomorrow morning you will read in the capitalistic press of the terrible John Most. Now, any one who doesn't like John Most will be given an opportunity to say so. Representatives of the press are invited to stand up here and talk to his face, instead of writing a lot of lies without signing their names." Needless to say, none of the reporters present accepted the invitation, and the next morning lurid accounts of the meeting appeared in the papers. However, they pronounced the meeting very orderly, and, it was very evident that people went away well satisfied.

The Denver section of the S. L. A. gave an entertainment in the same hall that evening, and no doubt were much surprised at the unusual large attendance; this may be accounted for by the fact that a good many people came expecting to hear John Most, but were greatly disappointed to find that his lecture in the afternoon was his last public appearance in Denver.

WM. HOLMES.

A MATTER OF OPINION.

The Albany Journal has the following: "The Boers have proved that they are stubborn fighters; that it is difficult to dislodge them from entrenchments which are well nigh impregnable; but they are the same Boers who steadfastly refused to confer citizenship under reasonable conditions, while levying taxes without condition, upon the strangers who came to dwell in their country and to whom credit for the progress that has been made there is due. They are the same Boers who are so bigoted that they absolutely bar from citizenship all men whose religious belief differs from their own."—Suppose that what the Journal says is all true, does it prove anything? Are they to be subjugated simply because they do not think as we do? What have we just done in Congress? We have turned out a man from one of our States who happens to believe that polygamy is better than keeping mistresses.—The Newark Courier.

PROFIT SHARING.

"The Invernesshire militia, over 1,000 strong, was mobilized at Aldershot lost week for duty. The men volunteered for service, which usualy means garrison duty at Malta, Gibralta or some other pleasant spot, and all but 14 passed the doctor. They form one of the finest militia battalions in Britain.

"They were paraded and exhorted to volunteer for South Africa, but there was not a solitary response. Their officers pleaded earnestly and then one man, stepping forward as spokesman, said his comrades would volunteer for the war if they got a share in the gold mines when the Transvaal was conquered, but not otherwise. So the appeal failed."

Three times three for the canny Scots! They have settled the war question, at least for themselves, and shown the way for the rest of the world to do so. It is the best way to stop the blood shedding war; and also the best way to stop that still worse war, which we always have on hand, the war of commerce, trade and usury, or rent, interest and profit, which is sucking the life-blood out of Labor. We have to demand our full share of the profits, that is, *all we produce*. Don't be fooled by the childish tommy rot now so prevalent against the trusts. The trusts are the government and there is but one remedy: cut it down, tear up the stumps, and burn the roots But who can do this? Those who labor and produce all the wealth can do it, and only they can do it. Stop thinking of that blasting ballot trick and concentrate your ideas on bare facts like the Scotchmen did.

KINGHORN-JONES.

Literature.

OUR WORSHIP OF PRIMITIVE SOCIAL GUESSES. By Edwin C. Walker. Fair Play Publishing Co., New York, N. Y. 63 pp. Price: 15 cents.

It is with a sense of undue tardiness that I herewith record my impression of this pamphlet. The many calls on my time during my present trip may partly excuse my delay in recommending this valuable work to the readers of Free Society.

The title is unusually felicitous, and almost a stroke of genius in itself. It exactly expresses the root-principle of that aimless mental drifting which forms the greater part of what we know as public sentiment. It is indeed to the blind groping of ignorant and barbarous ages that our vaunted civilization turns for the greater number of its social institutions and ethical ideals. Only the few dare face the problems of today in the spirit of an independent quest for truth. The moth-eaten garment of conservatism is supposed to be invested with a peculiar sanctity, merely on account of its age. Tradition, rather than reason, is appealed to as arbiter between contending ideas. The "dead hand" still retains its paralyzing grasps on the living intelligence. Hence the assaults of so able a combatant as Mr. Walker are greatly needed.

Mr. Walker is a keen and trenchant debater, and absolutely merciless. Woe to the opponent who attempts to catch him napping, or trap him with a sophistry or verbal juggle! Scarcely a radical writer, unless it be that grand and peerless veteran, C. L. James, has so keen a scent for a fallacy. One almost pities a man as he writhes under the stinging rebuke, cutting sarcasm, or scathing criticism, which he has brought on himself in an unguarded moment.

The production in question, a pamphlet of sixty-three pages, consists of a number of essays, several of them reprints with valuable improvements, and the remainder now printed for the first time. All deal with phases of the sex question. The treatment in each case is logical and forcible. Perfect clearness of expression, aptness and beauty of illustration, and a masterly literary style, characterize each essay. Mr. Walker is exceptionally fortunate in the possession of a fine vocabulary, and in unusual delicacy of perfection with regard to the choice of language. Hence it is that this pamphlet may be unhesitatingly placed in the hands of any person, notwithstanding its uncompromisingly radical tone, without fear of giving offense to any, save to those who are habitually shocked at the sight of the naked truth.

Those Anarchists who are but slightly acquainted with the principles of sex reform, or inclined to scout its importance, need to read this work. It will open their eyes to much of which they never have dreamed, and will effectually cure them of all tendency to look on "free love" as an unworthy ideal, a side issue, or a trivial matter. To the thorough-going propagandist, the book will prove a perfect arsenal of facts and arguments. He will do well to provide himself with several copies, and to pass them around where they will do the most good. The fascinating style, combined with the excellence of the matter and the lucidity of the argument, make the work unusually readable. It should be in the hands of every comrade, every sex reformer, and every social thinker of whatever school. The extreme lowness of the price removes all excuse for doing without it. If you fail to procure it, you rob yourself of a treat, and of an effective means of propaganda. Order it of Free Society at once.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

RECEIPTS.

Eugene Ross, $2.50 Behrman, Shuloff, each $1. Maisel, 75c. Raabe, Mizzle, Sigilman, Caverly, Gronnel, each 50c. Katzman, Olsher, Johnoff, Abrams, Kruger, Mintz, Turner, Raymond, Hurwitz, 25c.

For Chicago.

A grand ball will be given by the International Workingmen's Group for the benefit of the Jewish weekly, Freie Arbeiter-Stimme and Free Society, March 3, 8 p. m., at the Lessing's Club House, 447 W. Tailor St.

Admission 25 cents. Tickets can be secured from the undersigned.

All friends of our cause are cordially invited.

222 DeKoven St. CHAS. KLEINMAN, Sec.